UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA * Case No. 16-MJ-1000(PK)

*

* Brooklyn, New York
* November 12, 2016

*

DAN ZHONG,

*

Defendant. *

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR ARRAIGNMENT BEFORE THE HONORABLE ARLENE R. LINDSAY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

V.

For the Government: IAN RICHARDSON, ESQ.

DOUGLAS PRAVDA, ESQ.

Asst. United States Attorney
United States Attorney's Office

271 Cadman Plaza Brooklyn, NY 11201

For the Defendant: THOMAS FITZPATRICK, ESQ.

Certified Interpreter: MS. PATSY ONG

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

Fiore Reporting and Transcription Service, Inc. 4 Research Drive, Suite 402 Shelton, Connecticut 06484 (203)929-9992

```
2
 1
             (Proceedings commenced at 1:19 p.m.)
 2
                  THE CLERK: Okay. United States v. Dan Zhong.
 3
        Counsel, please state your name for the record.
                  MR. RICHARDSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Ian
 4
        Richardson and Douglas Pravda for the United States.
 5
                  THE COURT: Good afternoon.
 6
 7
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
 8
        Thomas Fitzpatrick for the defendant, Dan Zhong.
 9
                  THE COURT: All right. And I take it that's -- and
        I'm assuming it's a Chinese speaking interpreter. Is that --
10
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: It's a Mandarin interpreter, Your
11
12
        Honor.
                  THE COURT: Mandarin. All right. And can we have
13
        the interpreter state her name for the record?
14
15
                  THE INTERPRETER: Patsy Ong.
16
                  THE COURT: All right. Ms. Ong, is it?
                  THE INTERPRETER: Yes, Your Honor.
17
                  THE COURT: O-H-N-G, or am I pronouncing it --
18
19
                  THE INTERPRETER: O-N-G, Ong.
20
                  THE COURT: O-N -- right. Ms. Ong, please raise
21
        your right hand.
22
             (The interpreter is sworn.)
23
                  THE COURT: All right. Then I want to confirm, Mr.
24
        Fitzpatrick, have you had an opportunity with the aid of Ms.
25
        Ong, to review the complaint that has previously been signed
```

But I want you to also understand that as Mr. Fitzpatrick is here to represent you, you're entitled to have a lawyer represent you until this case is concluded. So if it gets to a point where you cannot afford a lawyer, then of course the Court will appoint counsel to represent you until the case is concluded.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I also want to tell you you have a Fifth Amendment

2.1

to the Government, give you an opportunity to discuss with the defendant any package on bail.

MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, we briefly discussed with the defendant the bail package that he's proposing. I can allow Mr. Fitzpatrick to explain to the court what bail package he's prepared at this time, if that's helpful, or I can recount my discussions with Mr. Fitzpatrick.

THE COURT: All right. Have you provided counsel with a copy of the letter submitted to the Court with respect to bail?

MR. RICHARDSON: We have, Your Honor. Mr. Fitzpatrick was presented a copy of the detention letter this morning.

THE COURT: Okay. So, what is the Government's position on bail, other than what we've stated in the letter, which is very clear that you're seeking detention?

MR. RICHARDSON: That's correct, Your Honor.

The Government is seeking a permanent order of detention because the defendant presents a very serious risk of flight.

Under the circumstances of this case and the information that the government has obtained in the course of the investigation, obviously, first of all the charges against the defendant are very serious. The maximum penalties in the serious charge is 20 years.

2.1

And as detailed in government's complaint, the initial very preliminary guidelines calculations that the defendant faces very serious potential charges of incarceration.

As a result, he has a strong incentive to flee.

There's also -- what the Court needs to consider here is the fact that the defendant could escape easily from the government if he were allowed to be released on bail.

And that's because in part, first, the defendant could easily flee to the Chinese Mission or the Chinese Consulate. The Chinese Mission, his business has an office he has access to. This isn't a typical case in which there is a theoretical risk that some foreign national could flee to an embassy or a mission or a consulate. The defendant actually has an office at the mission.

And so there is very serious concern here that he could put himself beyond the reach of U.S. law enforcement authorities by taking a rather short trip to the PRC Mission in midtown Manhattan, or the PRC Consulate.

In addition to that -- and I would note that there is no amount of electronic monitoring that would adequately permit the Government to prevent that flight.

Another important note here is the defendant has vast financial resources at his disposal and in his control.

And those resources take the form of numerous bank accounts

held in the name of various different entities affiliated with or associated with the construction business that he operates.

They also take into account the significant wealth of other of the defendant's family members who are overseas, and it also takes into -- I would also note that because of the amounts that we've detailed in the detention letter, the amount of money that he has access to would give him a very significant incentive to flee, and it also means that he would not be in bad shape if he were to leave behind the resources that he has here in the United States.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let me develop that with you. I've spoken to the Pretrial Services officer. I understand that there are assets in China as well. Is that correct?

MR. RICHARDSON: Our understanding, Your Honor, is at the very least the defendant has extremely wealthy family members in China and -- that have assets in China and in other countries that would potentially be available to him.

Even if his assets within the United States were encumbered, there's obviously the risk that those assets could be deployed to affect his escape and justice here in the United States.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask the Pretrial Services officer right now to just describe what you stated to me on

2.1

the record with respect to whatever business contacts the defendant has in China. So, at least counsel are aware of what I'm considering as well.

THE PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICER: Yes, Your Honor.

The defendant stated to me that he operates his business, not only here in the United States, but also operates working contracts in China, and stated to me that earns about \$33,000 a month from China in commission from those business — whatever they are, contracts.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Is there anything else you wanted to add to that, Mr. Pravda?

MR. RICHARDSON: Mr. Richardson, Your Honor. I apologize. Mr. Pravda is standing next to me here.

Your Honor, I believe that that significantly understates the resources that are available to the defendant, in China, and I believe that the defendant has significant resources.

I had a moment to speak with the Pretrial Services officer before this proceeding. I understand the defendant has -- there are a number of properties in the United States that are -- over which he has extensive control.

And I mean, I would note, for example, as we described in the detention letter, the defendant wrote two checks totaling approximately \$2 million for a deposit on apartments that were purchased in the name of a limited

liability company at the Time Warner Center.

So, that is just an example of the kinds of assets that are available to this defendant and just a reason why this Court should find that he is a serious risk of flight.

THE COURT: All right. Let me -- Mr. Fitzpatrick, do you have any kind of a package that you're proposing today?

MR. FITZPATRICK: Yes, Your Honor. We would be prepared, obviously, to give up his passport, to consent to home confinement with electronic monitoring, and even a private security guard that we would pay for at our expense, and he would put up his home in which he has about \$375,000 of equity.

And if Your Honor wanted additional cash or property security we would look into that. But I submit to Your Honor that wealth alone is not a motive to flee, and I would be prepared to address the reasons why he is not likely to flee.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Okay. First of all, Your Honor, he has been a permanent resident here since 2010. He has a green card.

He lives in Livingston, New Jersey, in a house he and his wife own, with their 8year old daughter. And his

wife is here. He also has an older daughter, Nan who is 23 years old. She's also here. And he has a son who is 21-years old, who is in college. Nan is in dental school at NYU and is engaged to be married.

So he has substantial roots here. His life is here. He's the president of a company called U.S. Rilin Corporation. It's a construction company in Manhattan that the government has characterized as the U.S. arm of the, apparently Chinese company. We would dispute that, Your Honor.

This company has been under investigation for a while. It has fully complied with grand jury subpoenas.

And in fact just last week, with the assistance of Mr.

Zhong, the company in three days produced all the payroll records and I-9 records that the government requested.

Since Mr. Zhong learned that he was under investigation earlier this year, he traveled to China for his father's birthday. The company counsel informed the government when he was leaving. He was interviewed at the airport on his departure and on his arrival. He knew he was under investigation, he went to China, and he came back. His life is here.

He does not speak English, Your Honor, even though he's been here that long. He does not speak English. I always talk to him with an interpreter. And --

THE COURT: Well, when you say for that long, I thought you said he set up roots here in 2010.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Yes, Your Honor. So but in that time he has not learned to speak English.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.1

MR. FITZPATRICK: So --

THE COURT: I just wanted to clear that up.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Yes. So, Your Honor, it's very, very difficult for him at the MDC not being able to speak the language. And obviously, it will be very, very difficult for him and me to meet to prepare to defend this case.

Plus, he has medical issues. In fact, when he was transported by the FBI to the Marshal Service on Thursday, I was told the marshals were concerned enough about his health that they sent him to the hospital and required a letter from the hospital saying he was fit for confinement, I believe is the expression.

So he does have health issues. He has high blood pressure, high cholesterol, high blood sugar. He has a stomach disorder. He has a heart murmur. The one medication he took with him — not a medication but a substance to take in the event of an emergency with his heart, which has happened to him once before.

So his life is here, Your Honor. He wants to stay

here and I think -- I know this is not a preliminary hearing, but from having read the complaint and the detention letter which I've barely been able to read, I read it enough that I see where they're going, but I haven't read it in totality. I submit, Your Honor, we can demonstrate that the government's charges are considerably overblown.

And I think that goes to the question of risk of flight, and the notion in the detention letter that his codefendant, Mr. Landong Wang, fled the country, Your Honor.

As I understand it, on the 9th of November he was notified by the State Department that his A-2 immunity was going to be revoked on the 11th, and he'd be subject to prosecution. I also understand, I don't have first hand knowledge --

THE COURT: So, what? What does that mean? That he left because he was going to be subject to prosecution?

MR. FITZPATRICK: Your Honor, I think it's more than that because I also understand that he and his lawyer met with the government before he left. So he did not flee. My understanding is he had the choice to stay here --

THE COURT: So, let's put him aside for the moment. He's not before us, but the way you described it, it sounded like when he learned that his — that as of November 11th his immunity would be revoked, he left before the 11th. That's what you seem to describe.

```
MR. FITZPATRICK: Your Honor, my --
```

THE COURT: But that's not who's before me today so let's move on to your client.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Okay. But I think they would argue if one co-defendant did it, he's likely to do it. And I submit, it's much more complicated than that. I believe the Government knew he was leaving. So, I think, Your Honor, he simply did not flee and Mr. Zhong is not about to flee.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

MR. FITZPATRICK: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I don't dispute that there is a -- there may be a possible package in this case. First of all, I want to make it clear, I do find the defendant to be a risk of flight.

I mean, first of all the connections to China, family in China, business interest in China, property in China, money in China, I'm also persuaded by some of the allegations in the complaint and that — as outlined and sworn to, that several of the laborers who are under grand jury subpoena with the aid of your client, Mr. Zhong, were given tickets so they could leave the United States before they would have to appear before the grand jury in an investigation that involved him.

So, that hardly suggests that the defendant is

assistance of your client. So, I doubt very much that the

question of whether or not they had an appearance on

24

25

November 4th or not was resolved as they boarded the plane. But I'll hear from the government on that issue.

MR. RICHARDSON: Your intuition is correct, Your Honor. They were served with grand jury subpoenas in the evening. They then booked tickets the next morning, flying out of a different airport and left the country.

And although we are in litigation — it's correct that we are in litigation with company counsel as to whether or not those workers need to return to the United States to comply with those subpoenas, it is strongly indicative that they were taken out of the country in order to avoid their availability to testify in the grand jury. So, I would agree, Your Honor, that is a strong indication here that there is potential risk that the defendant would further obstruct the investigation if he were allowed to remain free on bail.

THE COURT: All right. Now -- and I also am highly concerned about the defendant's access to the mission or the consulate, and he may be able to basically obtain sanctuary through that vehicle. That's what the electronic monitoring --

MR. FITZPATRICK: Your Honor, may --

THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Fitzpatrick. Let me finish, then I'll hear from you.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Sorry, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The electronic monitoring, inadequate. You proposed something with respect to some security. That may be a possibility, but here's what I believe has got to happen, Mr. Fitzpatrick.

You have to work out a very detailed plan that involves the sequestration of his assets, you know, the surrender of his passport, the electronic monitoring, house arrest, with a private security system that is 24 hours, seven days a week.

It is a huge invasion on the privacy of the family but it is the package that would -- the only kind of package which would satisfy this Court that he is being sufficiently monitored such that he can't avail himself of the mission or the consulate so that he's able to flee. I do find there's a risk of flight here.

There has absolutely got to be some sequestration of his assets so that it's limited so his access to money is limited to whatever his personal expenses are, and not beyond that.

So a lot of work has to be done in order to come up with a proposal that -- and by the way, it must be passed -- reviewed by the Government so that they have some input into this. So, my idea is, until you can work up a very detailed plan -- I'm not going to release him today. That's just not going to happen.

But I will enter a temporary order of detention and give you time to come, you know, put that plan before the government to confer with them on what might work.

Obviously, the government could object to the plan or have its own demands in that regard, but that's -- something could be discussed -- that's a discussion for another day. But right now the plan that's on deck is insufficient.

MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, may I make a recommendation to the Court?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. RICHARDSON: Instead of a temporary order of detention to require the defendant to appear, I believe, in four days, very soon, given that there might need to be some negotiation with counsel to see if counsel can come up with some package that would satisfy the government that the defendant would not be a flight risk --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. RICHARDSON: -- it may be more useful to have a permanent order of detention with leave to reopen. That way that when the package is available an application could be made to the duty magistrate here in Brooklyn to resolve that instead of putting us on a strict deadline to come back in a few days.

THE COURT: Well, that may make sense because Mr.

Fitzpatrick, you've got a lot of work to do. You've got to line up a security agency, you've got to work out the details of it. You've got to figure out how you're going to sequester, and what are the assets. Pretrial Service is going to have to do a detailed review of what assets he has. Maybe it might require financial statements. I don't know.

But if I do it as a TUD I don't know that I'm giving you adequate time either, Mr. Fitzpatrick, which is sort of what the government is saying. So, what do you say about that?

MR. FITZPATRICK: Well, Your Honor, can't you order a temporary order of detention and then adjourn it if we need more time?

THE COURT: You could do it that way, sure.

Temporary order of detention is usually only several days.

Is that going to -- you know, is that a productive

appearance? That's sort of what I'm asking.

Are you, in two days or three days, going to have enough time to put down -- put together a detailed package and confer with the government to secure whatever approval they might give in three days?

MR. FITZPATRICK: I'm not sure I can do that, Your Honor, but to be honest with you, a temporary order of detention sounds a lot better than a permanent order of detention with the right to reopen.

```
19
 1
                  THE COURT: Okay.
 2
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: And I think it --
 3
                  THE COURT: And a permanent order would only mean
 4
        that when you're ready, Mr. Fitzpatrick, you can absolutely
        petition the Court to put the case on, so it would be left
 5
        to you to set the schedule. That's what a permanent order
 6
 7
        would do for you.
 8
                  So, when you have, you know, everything lined up
        in accordance with what the Court has outlined, you would
 9
        simply contact counsel for the government and tell them we
10
        want to put the case on. So, it doesn't mean you don't have
11
12
        control of the situation, or that it goes into some black
13
        hole. It just means you're the one who determines when the
        next date should be because you're ready.
14
15
                  So tell me what you want to do.
16
                  MR. RICHARDSON: And, Judge, just for the record -
17
                  THE COURT: Well, let me just hear -- yeah, go
18
19
        ahead.
20
                  MR. RICHARDSON: I would just say, for the record,
21
        Judge, that's also the way that it's typically done.
22
        least in Brooklyn with the magistrate judges that's
23
```

25

```
1
                  So, to the extent that counsel is concerned that
 2
        this is an aberration, this is a pretty typical part of the
 3
                  THE COURT: No, I'm sure Mr. Fitzpatrick is
 4
        experienced enough to know that. But I'll be happy to go
 5
        with his recommendation and --
 6
 7
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Your Honor, may I test your
 8
        patience just a little bit longer?
 9
                  THE COURT: Of course.
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Because the first thing you
10
        mentioned was a need to sequester his assets. As far as I
11
        know from my client, he does not have property in China.
12
        received his commission income from a company in China.
13
        Income.
14
15
                  As far as I know, he has no property there. And
16
        the fact that family members are wealthy does not -- you
        can't automatically make the connection that they're going
17
        to subsidize him if he flees to China. I just don't think
18
        that's a fair inference.
19
20
                  THE COURT: Well, if he has accounts here, and a
21
        business account, but I'm given to understand that he has
22
        some management or control of a business account, then
23
        that's going to be part of what's going to be controlled.
24
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Certainly his --
25
                  THE COURT: I mean, the whole thing is -- yeah.
```

MR. FITZPATRICK: From his --

THE COURT: Assets. I'm not talking about -- or him -- assets controlled by him and his wife, his immediate family, that's what you've got to look to, and be aware that the government has a lot of information about this client, your client. So --

MR. FITZPATRICK: Alleged information.

THE COURT: Oh, I'm not expecting you to sequester the assets of aunts and uncles and brothers and sisters, but his -- the money he has access to, absolutely. I want some control over it.

Now, these are my ideas. My thoughts that I'm throwing out to you, which I think would satisfy the Court that the package would address the risk of flight that the Court has. But the specifics of it remain to be worked out. I'm giving you some overview of how this could be constructed in a way that would address the real risk — concern the Court has of a risk of flight.

And just as importantly, you know, when we talk about risk of flight we're not just talking about getting on a plane and going to China where he can set up, you know, his operations or carry on his life.

I'm talking about the other concern as well, with him just going off to the mission or the consulate, and then escaping prosecution through that method as well.

So, those are my thoughts. We're not going to resolve that here. Only -- the only question to resolve right now, Mr. Fitzpatrick, he's not walking out of this courtroom. I've decided that part.

The only part that is still open to question is whether or not we do it as a temporary order or a permanent order and give you the flexibility to put it back on the calendar.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Your Honor, may I have a moment to ask my client one question in connection with what you just said? I want to clarify something with him? Thank you.

(Counsel and defendant confer.)

MR. FITZPATRICK: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, on that critical question about whether he has an office at the Chinese Mission and special access to that, I've never heard that before and I just asked my client that and he says that's not true.

So does that mean any Chinese citizen who has a problem can walk into the Chinese Mission and avoid American law enforcement? I don't get it.

MR. RICHARDSON: Sorry, Judge. You may be muted. We can't hear you.

(Pause.)

THE COURT: The question Mr. Fitzpatrick asked, is

```
23
 1
        whether or not --
                  THE CLERK: Getting terrible feedback.
 2
 3
                  THE COURT: Okay.
 4
                  MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.
 5
                  THE COURT: All right. So, the question that Mr.
        Fitzpatrick asked as I understood it, was is it the claim of
 6
 7
        the government that any Chinese citizen could walk into the
 8
        mission or the consulate and thereby evade prosecution by
        the United States? The answer to that is, yes.
 9
                  If the consulate or mission were willing to
10
        entertain that person's presence, and in this case Mr. Zhong
11
12
        really has relations or business connections to the
        consulate, does business for them, his whole business was
13
        involved in supposedly doing repairs at the consulate.
14
15
                  I'll hear from the government on that, but that's
16
        what I understood.
17
                  MR. RICHARDSON: Yes, Your Honor. That's correct.
                  I won't speculate as to the basis for the
18
19
        defendant's claims, but the truth is that the defendant runs
        the U.S. operations for this construction business.
20
2.1
                  And what he's charged with doing in this complaint
22
        is using construction workers who are here in the United
23
```

is using construction workers who are here in the United

States on diplomatic visas to do work for the PRC Consulate

and the mission, abusing his control over them to make them

do private contracting work.

24

25

And he does have access --

2.1

THE COURT: There's no question he has connections to the mission and the consulate.

So, to be able to get that kind of approval for work to be done at the mission or the consulate gives him more access than most. So, on the question of whether or not that's a concern (indiscernible).

So, Mr. Fitzpatrick, back to you. Do you prefer a temporary order of detention, which could wind up just wasting time? Or -- I mean, I'm going to make the decision for you if I don't get some good reason to be a permanent order of detention with (indiscernible) up for you to put it back on when you're ready.

MR. FITZPATRICK: Would the matter come back before you if I consented to the permanent order?

THE COURT: No, it would a Brooklyn case.

But this record and recommendation to this court would be before the magistrate and, of course, that magistrate, whoever that might be, could decide that whatever package you propose is inadequate. That they could review this consistent with Title 18, 3142.

MR. FITZPATRICK: If you entered a temporary order of detention, would the matter come back -- would the matter stay with you?

THE COURT: It would not. You seem to like me,

```
25
 1
        Mr. Fitzpatrick.
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: I do, Your Honor. I do. May I
 2
 3
        have one more minute to consult with company counsel?
 4
                  THE COURT: Yes.
 5
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Thank you.
             (Pause.)
 6
 7
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Thank you, Your Honor. Yes,
 8
        Your Honor, we believe we can put a package together by the
        middle of next week. And so, yes, I am requesting a
 9
        temporary order of detention.
10
                  THE COURT: Okay. So, let's (inaudible).
11
12
                  MR. RICHARDSON: Sorry, Judge. We're having
13
        trouble hearing you.
14
                  THE COURT: Okay. I just need a date next week.
15
                  MR. RICHARDSON: Judge, I understand based on the
16
        statute it's five days on motion of the defendant, which
        would be Thursday, November 17th, and I think typically
17
18
        these are held at 11:00 a.m.
19
                  THE COURT: Thursday, 11/17.
20
                  MR. RICHARDSON: That's correct, Your Honor,
2.1
        November 17th at 11:00 a.m.
22
                  THE COURT: All right. So, that's when the order
23
        of detention should be signed and I'm going to sign a
24
        medical form requesting that the defendant be examined for
25
        whatever issues he has.
```

```
26
 1
                  Were you able to hear that?
 2
                  MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.
 3
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Yes, Your Honor. Yes.
 4
                  THE COURT: Okay. All right. I don't think
        there's any reason -- well, Mr. Fitzpatrick, have you
 5
        conferred with your client about waiving a preliminary
 6
 7
        hearing?
 8
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: I have not had the opportunity
        to do that, Your Honor. I think it may be a little
 9
10
        premature.
                  If I don't waive it, they'll indict him so I
11
12
        probably would be inclined to waive but I'd like a chance to
        talk to him about that.
13
14
                  THE COURT: So make sure that's addressed on the
15
        17th.
16
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Yes, Your Honor.
                  THE COURT: All right.
17
18
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Your Honor, I had one more --
19
        one more logistical issue to put before you. It's my
20
        problem and my neglect, not yours.
21
                  I went to the MDC yesterday afternoon to see my
22
        client. My Secure Pass, which I didn't realize you use in
23
        federal facilities, has expired and I haven't renewed it
24
        yet. So, they wouldn't let me in.
```

Now, they said I could go to Legal to see if I

25

```
1
        could provide some other kind of identification. Otherwise
 2
        I have to try and get approved as an ordinary visitor. So,
 3
        I haven't had a chance to speak to legal because they were
        closed yesterday.
 4
 5
                  Is it possible that Your Honor could issue an
        order that I can be admitted there, or that he could be
 6
 7
        brought here to consult with me?
 8
                  THE COURT: I'll tell you what. Have -- he's not
        going to be brought here to consult with you, but if you
 9
        submit a proposed order to the Court, and you can submit it
10
        to my chambers, I'm out at Central Islip, I'd be happy to
11
        sign an order which would allow you to have access to your
12
13
        client until you're able to get the Secure Pass.
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: But you wouldn't be able to do
14
15
        it until we put a package together? Is that what you said?
                  THE COURT: That isn't what I said.
16
17
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Sorry.
                  THE COURT: I said, prepare, in draft -- prepare
18
19
        an order for my signature.
20
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Thank you.
2.1
                  THE COURT: (Inaudible) which would give you
22
        access to your client at the MDC until you're able to get
23
        the Secure Pass.
24
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: Thank you. Thank you, Your
25
        Honor.
```

```
1
                  THE COURT: All right. Anything else?
                  MR. RICHARDSON: Your Honor, the defendant should
 2
        be required to surrender his passport to Pretrial Services.
 3
 4
        It is -- we don't have it right now.
 5
                  We do have -- the only piece of property that was
        taken from the defendant on his arrest was his driver's
 6
 7
        license, and the agents have just provided it back to the
 8
        defendant, or through counsel.
 9
                  THE COURT: Do you have that with you?
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: I have it, Your Honor. I'm
10
        ready to give it up. I'm turning it over to Mr. Manginaro
11
12
        right now.
1.3
                  THE COURT: Anything else?
14
                  MR. RICHARDSON: No, Your Honor. And I
15
        understand, for the record, that the preliminary hearing has
        been deferred until the 11/17 detention hearing.
16
17
                  THE COURT: And let's make sure that conditions
        (inaudible).
18
19
                  MR. RICHARDSON: We will, Your Honor.
20
                  THE COURT: Okay. All right, folks. You need
21
        anything else, then?
22
                  MR. RICHARDSON: Not from the government, Your
23
        Honor.
24
                  MR. FITZPATRICK: No, Your Honor.
25
                  THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
```